

REMARKS

The Examiner's Final Office Action of September 24, 2003 has been received and its contents reviewed. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the consideration given to the above-identified application.

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 17, and 22 are independent.

Referring to the detailed final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-18, 20-23, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sawada (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,317 – hereafter Sawada) in view of Kuwabara (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,332). Further, claims 3, 8, 19, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Sawada, in view of Kuwabara and further in view of Jeong (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,801). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

As submitted in the previous Amendment filed July 7, 2003, independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 14 have been amended so as to include a feature of a digital video signal dividing circuit which is fed with an image signal processed by an image signal processing circuit. The digital video signal dividing circuit is also recited in independent claims 17 and 22.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges the deficiency of Sawada as lacking a digital video signal dividing circuit, as well as a controller feeding to a display panel. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner cites Kuwabara, inasmuch as Kuwabara teaches the digital video signal dividing circuit. In response, Applicants respectfully remind the Examiner that the pending independent claims recite a control circuit feeding pulses to the digital video signal dividing circuit. On the other hand, Kuwabara merely teaches a digital video signal dividing circuit.

It is well settled that when combining the references in order to support a prima facie case of obviousness, the references must be considered in their entirety. It is further settled that the mere fact that the prior art may be modified to reflect features of the claimed invention does not make the modification and hence the claimed invention obvious unless the desirability of such modification is suggested by the prior art itself. Moreover, the claimed invention cannot be used as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the prior art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious, In Re Fritsch, 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Additionally, the statements and facts at issue set forth in a

reference leading one of ordinary skill in the art away from the proposed modification must also be fully considered when combining references in order to support a prima facie case of obviousness.

At least for the reason that Sawada fails to teach, disclose, or suggest a digital video signal dividing circuit and a controller feeding pulses to display panel, that Kuwabara merely teaches a digital video signal dividing circuit without any suggestion or motivation to include a controller feeding pulses to a display panel, and why or how the digital video signal dividing circuit is incorporated with Sawada to make Applicants' claimed invention, the §103(a) rejection is improper.

Should the Examiner maintain the §103(a) rejections over Sawada and Kuwabara, Applicants will request the Examiner to provide support in the cited prior art references which suggest or motivate the combination of their respective teachings to make Applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the argument set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending § 103(a) rejections.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Luan C. Do

Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 770-9300